Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

course); 10.695 vim. . .atque minas perfert (there are two things to endure); 7.203 haut vinclo nec legibus (the existence of the laws, and the binding compulsion which they exert, may be quite separate—as a modern civilization can testify); 9.603–604 natos. . .gelu duramus et undis (there are two sources of discomfort, either or both a menace to less sturdy children—the actual waters, and their cold temperature); G.2.174 res. . .laudis et artis (this means neither praise by means of art, nor art in praise. The two genitives are quite independent, though not strictly parallel. Vergil might have said either *res laudis*, 'a work that has obtained glory', the genitive being objective, or *res artis*, 'a work produced by art', the genitive being subjective. He chooses to fuse the two); 7.577 in crimine caedis et igni (Conington translates by "in the midst of the outcry at the slaughter", but here again, if we consider the two members separately, we shall see that the expression need not be so tortured. We might have alone *in crimine caedis*, 'the outcry over the slaughter', objective genitive, or *in igni caedis*, 'the heat, the tumult, of the slaughter', subjective genitive. *Crimine* suggests the noise, *igni* the general appearance and atmosphere); G.3.163 studium atque usum. . .agrestem (the subjective desire for farm labor, and the objective practice that produces the knowledge and ability necessary for success, are really distinct. It is not enough that the spirit be willing, the flesh must not be weak).

I close this survey in the hope that my hearers will agree with me that, whenever Vergil chooses to write as though he had two ideas, he really did have two, and that, accordingly, the term hendiadys is a misnomer, and the phenomenon which it is supposed to describe is non-existent.

HUNTER COLLEGE E. ADELAIDE HAHN

## THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY AGAIN

(*Concluded from page 190*)

The Bibliotheca of Apollodorus has been translated, in two volumes, by Sir James G. Frazer (the translator of Pausanias, and the author of The Golden Bough). The Introduction (ix-xliii) deals with The Author and his Book (ix-xxxiii), Manuscripts and Editions (xxxiii-xliii). A summary of the contents of the seven books of the Library is then given (xlv-lviii). A very elaborate Appendix (2.309–455) deals with themes suggested by various parts of Apollodorus's work:

I. Putting Children on the Fire (311–317); II. War of Earth on Heaven (318–326); III. Myths of the Origin of Fire (326–350); IV. Melampus and the Kine of Phylacus (350–355); V. The Clashing Rocks (355–358); VI. The Renewal of Youth (359–362); VII. The Resurrection of Glaucus (363–370); VIII. The Legend of Oedipus (370–376); IX. Apollo and the Kine of Admetus (376–383); X. The Marriage of Peleus and Thetis (383–388); XI. Phaethon and the Chariot of the Sun (388–394); XII. The Vow of Idomeneus (394–404); XIII. Ulysses and Polyphemus (404–455).

Professor Frazer thinks that Apollodorus wrote his Library at some time in either the first or the second century of our era. Of the man himself we know nothing. Of the Library, Professor Frazer writes as follows (1.xvii):

. . . <it is> a plain unvarnished summary of Greek myths, and heroic legends, as these were recorded in literature; for the writer makes no claim to draw on oral tradition, nor is there the least evidence or probability that he did so;. it may be taken as certain that he derived all his information from books alone. But he used excellent authorities and followed them faithfully, reporting, but seldom or never attempting to explain or reconcile, their discrepancies and contradictions. Hence his book possesses documentary value as an accurate record of what the Greeks in general believed about the origin and early history of the world and of their race.

Professor Frazer sees also in the Library of Apollodorus the element of folk-lore (xxvii-xxxi). He defines myths as "mistaken explanations of phenomena, whether of human life or of external nature" (xxvii); legends (xxviii-xxix) as

traditions, whether oral or written, which relate to the fortunes of a real people in the past, or which describe events, not necessarily human, that are said to have occurred at real places. Such legends contain a mixture of truth and falsehood, for were they wholly true, they would not be legends but histories;

and folk-tales (xxix) as

narratives invented by persons unknown and handed down at first by word of mouth from generation to generation, narratives which, though they profess to describe actual occurrences, are in fact purely imaginary, having no other aim than the entertainment of the hearer and making no real claim on his credulity. In short, they are fictions pure and simple, devised not to instruct or edify the listener, but only to amuse him; they belong to the region of pure romance.

If these definitions are right

. . .we may say that myth has its source in reason, legend in memory, and folk-tale in imagination; and that the three riper products of the human mind which correspond to these its crude creations are science, history, and romance.

On pages xlv-lviii, in the Summary, the contents of the Library are grouped by Professor Frazer as follows:

I. Theogony <1.1–6[1]>; II. The Family of Deucalion <1.7–9>; III. The Family of Inachus (Belus) <2.1–8>; IV. The Family of Agenor (Europa) <3.1–2>; V. The Family of Agenor (Cadmus) <3.4–7>; VI. The Family of Pelasgus <3.8–9>; VII. The Family of Atlas <3.10–12.6>; VIII. The Family of Asopus <3.12.6–13>; IX. The Kings of Athens <3.14–15>; X. Theseus <3.16. Epitome 1.1–24>; XI. The Family of Pelops <Epitome 2.1–16>; XII. Antehomerica <Epitome 3.1–35>; XIII. The "Iliad" <Epitome 4.1–8>; XIV. Posthomerica <Epitome 5.1–25>; XV. The Returns <Epitome 6.1–30>; XVI. The Wanderings of Ulysses <Epitome 7.1–40>.

Surely there is here for teachers, especially of Homer, Vergil, and Ovid, a wealth of material.

Professor Frazer has appended to the pages of the translation many notes in which he gives references to the principle passages of other ancient writers where each story is told; often, too, he indicates how far Apollodorus agrees with these other authors or differs

[1]The figures in angular brackets give the parts of the Bibliotheca involved.

from them. These references will enable one to make most interesting studies, comparative in nature, of the work of various authors.

It happens that I can illustrate, from a recent personal experience, the way in which the Library of Apollodorus can be made useful, especially to teachers of Vergil. A young woman, a student in a High School in Homestead, Pennsylvania, wrote me to ask the authority for the statement contained in my note on Aeneid 3.212, that "there were three Harpies". She stated that "the class, and instructress, and other members of the faculty, had always been under the impression that there were a number of these creatures—a *turba*, as Vergil himself puts it". Of the six or seven authorities consulted by them, only one, Anthon's Vergil, over one hundred years old, gave any definite number of Harpies.

I answered this letter at once. In order to do so, I consulted fifteen or twenty different books. I found that Conington gave the number of the Harpies as three, but it appeared, on examination of his note, that he had confused the earlier aspect of the Harpies, as wind-goddesses, with the version of them given in Apollonius Rhodius (2.188–300), and in Vergil, Aeneid 3. So I searched further. I discovered that the editors of the Aeneid had been more diplomatic and discreet than I, because they did not commit themselves on this subject. I wrote to my correspondent that the word *turba* had no bearing, really, on the number of the Harpies, because, though the word often enough, and perhaps usually, suggested a crowd, its connotation had to do very frequently with the behavior of the persons whom it described rather than with their number. I remarked also that to excited persons, such as the Trojans were at this time, three creatures like the Harpies would surely seem a *turba*, from several points of view at once. I found that in Pauly-Wissowa, Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, in the article Harpyien, the number of the Harpies in the Phineus-Harpies story is given as *two*, regularly, and their names were stated to be Aello and Okypete. I found also that Servius, in his note on Aeneid 3.209, gives the number of Harpies as three, and names them as Aello, Okypete, and Celaeno. But there is a good deal of foolishness, it seems to me, in parts of his rather lengthy note. I searched the pages of Apollodorus, and found the following passage, 1.9.21 (I use Professor Frazer's version):

> Thence they put to sea and came to land at Salmydessus in Thrace, where dwelt Phineus, a seer who had lost the sight of both eyes. Some say he was a son of Agenor, but others that he was a son of Poseidon, and he is variously alleged to have been blinded by the gods for foretelling men the future; or by Boreas and the Argonauts because he blinded his own sons at the instigation of their stepmother; or by Poseidon, because he revealed to the children of Phrixus how they could sail from Colchis to Greece. The gods also sent the Harpies to him. These were winged female creatures, and when a table was laid for Phineus, they flew down from the sky and snatched up most of the victuals, and what little they left stank so that nobody could touch it. When the Argonauts would have consulted him about the voyage, he said that he would advise them about it if they would rid him of the Harpies. So the Argonauts laid a table with viands beside him, and the Harpies with a shriek suddenly pounced down and snatched away the food. When Zetes and Calais, the sons of Boreas, saw that, they drew their swords, and, being winged, pursued them through the air. Now it was fated that the Harpies should perish by the sons of Boreas, and that the sons of Boreas should die when they could not catch a fugitive. So the Harpies were pursued and one of them fell into the river Tigres in Peloponnese, the river that is now called Harpys after her; some call her Nicothoe, but others Aellopus. But the other, named Ocypete or, according to others, Ocythoe (but Hesiod calls her Ocypode), fled by the Propontis till she came to the Echinadian Islands, which are now called Strophades after her; for when she came to them she turned. . . and being at the shore fell for very weariness with her pursuer. But Apollonius in the *Argonautica* says that the Harpies were pursued to the Strophades Islands and suffered no harm, having sworn an oath that they would wrong Phineus no more.

Apollodorus gives the number of the Harpies distinctly as but two. He gives two varying names for each. In consequence, it would be easy to get the impression of a host of Harpies, especially if one thought of all their names, and did not realize that, in Apollodorus, the four names mean only two Harpies. I finally hazarded the guess that Vergil had the two-Harpies story in mind, but made a very effective variation of it by adding the prophetic Celaeno. Lastly, getting interested in the matter and studying it further, I found representations from Greek days of the sons of Boreas killing the Harpies (see Baumeister, Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums, in the article Phineus). In two of these there were two sons of Boreas and two Harpies. To sum up, then, it would seem that I had authority enough for stating in my note on Aeneid 3.209, that "there were <to Vergil> three Harpies".

Many will hail with delight the fact that two volumes of the translation of Herodotus, covering Books 1–4, have appeared. The translation is by a thoroughly competent scholar, A.D.Godley, Hon. Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. In the General Introduction (1.vii-xviii), Mr. Godley writes briefly of Herodotus's life and work, and defends his reputation. Herodotus gives the best that was accessible to him; he "does not give it uncritically" (xii). One reason why Herodotus's narrative has been so often suspected is that, though he "has undoubtedly learnt much from documents engraved or written" (xiv), he "will not support his credit by producing his proofs. . . ; for the most part his *fontes* are included under 'what he has heard' . . . ".

To the first volume of the translation of Ausonius, by Hugh G. Evelyn White, reference was made in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.170. The second volume has now appeared. This contains renderings of The Epistles (3–153); Epigrams on Various Matters (154–217); The Thanksgiving of Ausonius of Bordeaux... for his Consulship, Addressed to the Emperor Gratian (218–269); Appendix to Ausonius (271–291), giving versions of various ancient poems, ordinarily edited with the works of Ausonius, but in reality of unknown authority. These include the Septem

Sapientium Sententiae; De Rosis Nascentibus; Sulpicia Queritur De Statu Rei Publicae et Temporibus Domitiani. Finally, the volume contains a translation of the Eucharisticus of Paulinus Pellaeus (304–351).

Professor John C. Rolfe, of the University of Pennsylvania, again appears as a contributor to the Library, this time as a translator of Sallust. Since there was no satisfactory text of Sallust, Professor Rolfe made his own. The Introduction deals with The Life and Works of Sallust (ix-xviii); The Pseudo-Sallustian Works (xviii-xix); The Manuscripts (xix-xxi); Bibliographical Notes (xxii). Versions are given of the Bellum Catilinae (2–129); Bellum Iugurthinum (132–381); Orations and Letters from the Histories (384–441); Pseudo-Sallustian Works (444–521). The last named division includes A Speech to Caesar, In his Old Age, On the State (444–461); Letter to Caesar On the State (462–491); An Invective Against Marcus Tullius (492–501); An Invective Against Sallust (502–521).

Professor H. E. Butler, of London University, well known as author of a volume entitled Post-Augustan Poetry, as translator of Apuleius, as author of an annotated edition of Propertius, and, recently, of an edition of Aeneid 6, offers, in four volumes, a complete translation of Quintilian. The Introduction to the work is altogether negligible (I. vii-ix). It would be easy to supplement and correct the Bibliography (xi-xiii). Professor Butler mentions the edition of Cicero, Brutus, by G. D. Kellogg, (Boston, 1889). He should have added that by K. W. Piderit[3], done by W. Friedrich (Leipzig, Teubner, 1889). In listing works on the history of Latin Rhetoric and Education, he names Norden, Antike Kunstprosa, 1898; there is a later edition. So, too, he names Volkmann, Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer, 1885. My copy of the third edition is dated in 1901. Mr. Butler does not deign to give first names of authors. In brief, then, this Introduction is extremely poor, at the other—and most undesirable—,extreme from those in the Loeb Library translations of Menander, Apollodorus, and Sallust.

A new rendering of the Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian is to be welcomed, because the last previous English translation was that in the Bohn Library, by J. S. Watson (I do not know when this was published. Professor Butler says of it, "reprinted in 1903". I have a copy, in two volumes, dated 1892, 1895).

C. K.

---

## REVIEWS

Greeks And Barbarians. By J. A. K. Thomson. London: George Allen and Unwin, Limited; New York: The Macmillan Company (1921). Pp. 218.

The talented young Oxonian, Professor Thomson, has already two notable volumes of essays to his credit—Studies in the Odyssey, and The Greek Tradition. Some of us had the pleasure of hearing a part of the material of this third work, Greeks and Barbarians, when Mr. Thomson was teaching in this country. To that residence here, it may be, are due a few bits of American slang which we hope will not too greatly shock the sensibilities of his British reviewers. They are easily forgotten amid the other qualities of his style—the fine taste in translation, the swift and sure strokes of description, the tempered sentiment and wise reflection, the gleams of Scottish humor, all revealing a hand which has gained increased power; while the wide choice of illustration exhibits a degree of learning which might well be envied by older scholars.

The book attempts to set forth in a clearer light that antithesis of Greek and Barbarian on which Thucydides first insisted, "the conflict. . .between the disciplined and the undisciplined temper, the constructive and the destructive soul". Surely no theme could afford more profitable discussion in times like those in which we are now living. Mr. Thomson continues the English tradition begun by Grote, the faculty of sensing all that is original and inspiring in Greek notions of liberty. He readily acknowledges and correctly appraises its mistakes and excesses, but he is unwilling to draw from them, as some German historians have done, the inference that popular government is unsafe and unabiding. Greek liberty, as he understands it, is liberty under the reign of law and order, and in this sense the "civilization-heroes" of Greek mythology, like Heracles, become champions for the cause of justice. Lest any one think that such an ideal leads to a stodgy immobility, let him read the conclusion of the chapter on Eleutheria. "Defense of law and order seemed *the most romantic thing a man could do*" (the italics are mine).

In seven chapters the antithesis between Greek and Barbarian is developed and illustrated: in the physical conflict of the Persian Wars; in the insistent claim of Freedom upon the Greek intellect and imagination, whereas among the Barbarians "all are slaves of one"; in the spirit of adventure which carried the Greeks into varied riches of experience, while the Barbarian stood still; in the Greek virtue of Sophrosyne, of wise and rational restraint, curbing those same emotions to which the Barbarian gave free rein; in the totally different belief of the Greeks about the gods, which may be allegorized in the battle between the gods and the Titans; and, finally, in the ever-recurrent difference between the Classic and the Romantic, a difference which the author lights up with new reflections, discarding the cut and dried methods so prevalent in modern books of disposing of the two concepts.

Nowhere does the method of the book show to better advantage than in the discussion of the Prometheus story. In all the weary pages of criticism and speculation which I have read concerning the conflict between the hero and Zeus, I have found no more discerning interpretation than that which Mr. Thomson offers here. It is again the case of Aeschylus vs. Shelley, but the Greek solution is revealed by a new